REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1 - 25 are pending, of which claims 1-4, 6-7, 10, 18 and 24 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1-4, 6-7, 10, 18 and 24 are simply to provide clarification and/or to correct informalities noted by the Applicant, and are not to overcome prior art or any other objections.

During an interview of April 3, 2008 the examiner cited a new reference U.S. patent number 7,284,199 to Parasnis et al. (hereinafter "Parasnis"). The applicant discussed amending the claims as shown in this response. The applicant has reviewed the reference and determined that Parasnis is a client based system, while the pending claims are related to a server system. Also Parasnis does not teach or suggest "identifying by a server a culture associated with the received HTML page request by examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to recognize culture identifiers", as recited (or similarly recited) in claims 1, 10 and 18. Applicant extends its appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation shown to the Applicant's undersigned representative during the interview. Further, in view of the discussion held during the interview, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10 and 18 to include this limitation to distinguish the claims over the Dyer, Allard and Frerebeau reference.

Claim Objection(s)

Claim 1 is objected to as including line numbers. The line numbers on line 7 and 24 have been deleted from the claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

A.   Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,742 to Dyer et al. (hereinafter, "Dyer"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,561 to Allard et al. (hereinafter, "Allard") (*Office Action* p. 3).

> **Amended Claim 1** recites:
>> A method of providing localization of a web service, comprising:
>> ·receiving <u>by the server</u> an HTML page request via a network from a client web browser in a requester of the web service;
>> identifying <u>by the server</u> a culture associated with the <u>received</u> HTML page request by <u>the server</u> examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to <u>recognize</u> culture identifiers;
>> identifying <u>by the server</u> a localization attribute and one or more values associated with the localization attribute in a requested page associated with the HTML page request;
>> determining <u>by the server</u> whether one of a plurality of satellite assemblies is associated with the identified culture;
>> referencing <u>by the server</u> the satellite assembly associated with the identified <u>localization</u> culture to locate content in the satellite assembly associated with each of the one or more values associated with the localization attribute, the satellite assembly being configured to provide the content prior to execution by <u>the</u> server of a script embedded in the requested page;
>> replacing <u>by the server</u> the identified one or more values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page with the content associated with the each of the one or more values located in the referenced satellite assembly;
>> running <u>by the server</u> scripts embedded in the requested web page with the replaced identified values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page to provide a culture-dependent response; and
>> transmitting <u>by the server via the network the requested web page containing</u> the culture-dependent response to the client web browser in the requester of the web service. [Emphasis Added]

Dyer and/or Allard do not teach or suggest the combination of feature(s) recited in amended claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Dyer and/or Allard do not teach or suggest "identifying by the server a culture associated with the received HTML page request by the server examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to recognize culture identifier", [emphasis added] as recited in amended claim 1.

Dyer discloses a multistep process to obtain localized content. In Dyer the client sends a selection of a language that the user wants to read in a web page, and then sends a web page request for the web page. Allard discloses sending a request to a server and the server parsing the request to determine whether to load a dynamic link library (column 5 lines 17 – 21). However, neither the cited portions of Dyer nor Allard discloses the server identifying the culture by the server examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to recognize a culture identifier, as recited in claim 1. Dyer discloses a multistep process to identify the culture, where the applicant can identify a culture with a server examining the HTML page request.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is allowable over the Dyer-Allard combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1 (either directly or indirectly). Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Amended Claim 10 recites:

A computing-based system for providing localization of a web service, comprising:

a server <u>configured to receive</u> a page request via a network from an agent;

a culture identification module <u>in the server</u> configured to identify a culture associated with the received page request by analyzing content embedded in the page request to <u>recognize</u> culture parameters;

a localization values parsing module configured to identify a localization attribute and values in a requested page associated with the <u>received</u> page request;

a key values parser configured to locate localized content associated with the localization attributes and localization values and to designate the localized content to replace content referenced by the localization attributes and localization values in the requested page;

a satellite assembly, selected using the culture identified by analyzing the <u>received</u> page request, that includes the localized content located by the key values parser, the satellite assembly providing the localized content to replace content on the requested page prior to a server executing a script containing the localized content embedded in the requested page;

wherein the localized content is associated with the identified culture and is utilized when the requested page is served to the agent making the page request<u>; and</u>

<u>a transmission module configured to transmit to the agent via the network the requested web page containing the localized content.</u> ·
[Emphasis Added]

Dyer and/or Allard do not teach or suggest the combination of feature(s) recited in claim 10. For example, the recited portions of Dyer and/or Allard do not teach or suggest "a culture identification module <u>in the server</u> configured to identify a culture associated with the received page request by analyzing content embedded in the page request to recognize culture parameters;"or "a transmission module configured to transmit to the agent via the network the requested web page containing the localized content." [emphasis added] as recited in claim 10.

As previously described with the rejection to claim 1, Dyer requires a multistep process to identify the culture. Allard describes sending a request to a server and the server parsing the request to determine whether to load a dynamic link library. However, Dyer and Allard do not describe a culture identification module in the server that identifies a culture associated with the received page request by analyzing content embedded in the page request to recognize culture parameters, as recited in claim 10.

Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over the Dyer-Allard combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 11-16 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 10 (either directly or indirectly). Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 18 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0135501 to Frerebeau et. al. (hereinafter, "Frerebeau"), and Allard in view of Dyer (*Office Action* p.7). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Amended Claim 18 recites:
> One or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform steps comprising:
> receiving by a server via a network an HTTP page request from a client for web content for a preferred culture;
> identifying by the server the preferred culture by examining content embedded in the received HTTP page request;
> determining by the server if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available;

localizing by the server the web content for the preferred culture if localized web content is available for the preferred culture;

localizing with the server the web content for a default culture if localized web content is not available for the preferred culture, wherein at least one of localizing the web content for the preferred culture and localizing the web content for a default culture includes referencing one of a plurality of satellite assemblies, selected using the identified preferred culture from the page request, to provide a localized content associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the default culture, the referenced satellite assembly being configured to replace the localized web content with non-localized web content on the requested page prior to the computer executing a script, said script being embedded in the requested page with the provided localized web content so that when the script is executed with provided localized web content, attributes of the requested page are known before being transmitted to the client;

executing by the server the script embedded within the requested page with the provided localized web content; and

delivering by the server the requested page with the executed script to the client via the network. [Emphasis Added]

Frerebeau and/or Allard and/or Dyer do not teach or suggest the combination of feature(s) recited in claim 18. For example, Frerebeau and/or Allard and/or Dyer do not teach or suggest "receiving by a server via a network an HTTP page request from a client for web content for a preferred culture;", "identifying by the server the preferred culture by examining content embedded in the received HTTP page request;" or "determining by the server if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available;", as recited in claim 18.

Frerebeau describes a system for localizing the content of documents by detecting localization tags in a document. Dyer requires a multistep process to identify the culture, by the client sending a selection of a language that the user wants to read in a web page, and then sending a web page request for the web page. Allard describes sending a request to a server, and the server parsing the

request to determine whether to load a dynamic link library. However, neither Frerebeau, Allard nor Dyer describe identifying a preferred culture with a server by examining content embedded in the received HTTP page request, as recited in claim 18.

Accordingly, claim 18 is allowable over the Frerebeau - Allard - Dyer combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 18 (either directly or indirectly). Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1 - 25 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _5/2c/c9_   By: _____

Steven C. Stewart
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 33,555
(206) 315-7909